

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/736,027	12/15/2003	Todd L. Vercoe	TV1-003US	4155
29150 7	590 11/10/2004		EXAM	INER
LEE & HAYES, PLLC 421 W. RIVERSIDE AVE, STE 500			BARRETT, SUZANNE LALE DINO	
SPOKANE, W	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3676	
			DATE MAILED: 11/10/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/736,027	VERCOE, TODD L.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Suzanne Dino Barrett	3676				
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet with th	ne correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFI after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pe  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by st Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply b . I reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) riod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS f atute, cause the application to become ABANDO	e timely filed  days will be considered timely. from the mailing date of this communication.  DNED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1	7 August 2004					
<u> </u>	This action is non-final.	,				
3) Since this application is in condition for allo	<del>_</del>					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 2-5 and 11-14 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) ⊠ Claim(s) 2-5 and 11-14 is/are rejected.  7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	drawn from consideration.	e				
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam	niner.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐	☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to	<del>-</del> '' '	` '				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cor		•				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International But * See the attached detailed Office action for a	ents have been received. ents have been received in Applic priority documents have been rece reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	cation No eived in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summ					
<ol> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB, Paper No(s)/Mail Date</li> </ol>		al Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/736,027 Page 2

Art Unit: 3676

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 2-5,11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over St. George 5,887,730 in view of van Staden et al 5,212,973.
- St. George teaches in Fig. 4a a gun rack comprising a wall plate 113 mounted to the wall (112) and forming a channel therewith to receive a plate 111 having lock means 116 thereon and tapered key portions 1143 to receive the keyed tapered ends 1141 of a stock piece 114. The stock piece receives the stock and trigger portion of a gun 2 (Fig.
- 1). St. George further discloses the use of a barrel loop for the barrel of the gun. The method limitations of claims 12-14 are considered inherent to the use of the disclosed device. Van Staden et al teach a locking member 23 having a spiral curvature to encase a steering wheel rim. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the locking member for the stock piece of St. George by changing the shape to a spiral helix curved piece as taught by van Staden et al to enhance the

Application/Control Number: 10/736,027

Art Unit: 3676

security of the lock device and prevent prying by presenting no entry point for a prying tool.

3. Claims 1,6-10,15-20 are further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hancock et al 5,078,279 in view of van Staden et al '973. Hancock et al teach a gun rack comprising a wall plate 11 with a channel 44 to slidably receive a plate 18 having keyways 29,30 which receive two key portions 31 of a stock piece which surrounds the stock of a gun. Van Staden et al teach a locking member 23 having a spiral curvature to encase a steering wheel rim. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the locking member for the stock piece of St. George by changing the shape to a spiral helix curved piece as taught by van Staden et al to enhance the security of the lock device and prevent prying by presenting no entry point for a prying tool.

## Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2-5,11-14 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. As set forth above, the newly cited references teach the use of a spiral shape for a locking hook member to enhance the security of the hook mount. Accordingly, claims 2-5,11-14 stand non-finally rejected.

Page 3

Art Unit: 3676

### Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Note, especially, the spiral locking members of Wu '691, Brady '001, Ta-Yung '158, Edmonson '315, Vito '757.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Suzanne Dino Barrett whose telephone number is 703-308-0825. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 8:30-7:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Will can be reached on 703-308-3870. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov.

Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the

Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Suzanne Dino Barrett Primary Examiner Art Unit 3676

sdb